DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 837 CS 501 711

TITLE [Violence Profiles for Fall Programming.]
INSTITUTION National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 35p.; Several tables may not reproduce well due to poor type

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Broadcast Industry; Change Strategies; *Mass Media; *Media Research; Publicize; Research Methodology; *Television; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS *Advertising; *National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting

ABSTRACT

This document presented by the National Citizens' Committee for Broadcasting at a 1976 press conference provides an assortment of materials concerned with violence in television. Among the materials included are "Who Sponsors the New Fall Violence?" by Nicholas Johnson, a description of and rationale for the study of advertisers who sponsor television violence, and a statement by Richard E. Palmer, president of the American Medical Association, concerning that organization's commitment, in the form of a $25,000 grant, to encourage media reform. Definitions are provided of the measures used to evaluate the level of violence in various programs. In addition, "An Evaluation of a System for the Continual Monitoring and Periodic Reporting of the Commercial Sponsorship of Television Violence" summarizes the findings of a study to analyze the reliability of two measures of television violence: the number of violent actions and the total time of violence in the program. This analysis was conducted on a sample of 23 prime-time network television programs aired during November 1976; examples of data tabulation methods are included. (KS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

PRESS RELEASE

NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR BROADCASTING
1028 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Rm. 402, Washington, D.C. 20036
202—466-8407

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Citizens Committee for
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Broadcasting
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For Release 10:00 am
Thursday, December 16, 1976

CONTACT: Ted Carpenter

[Violence Profiles for Fall Programming.]

WHO SPONSORS THE NEW FALL VIOLENCE?

Nicholas Johnson

ED141837

General Motor's Chevrolet is far and away the advertiser of the most prime time violent programming according to the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting (NCCB) 13 week study completed December 5 under a grant from the American Medical Association.

Our monitoring of violence, conducted jointly with bi Associates, a TV monitoring firm, shows that Peter Paul Candies was the least violent sponsor. Quest, Starsky and Hutch, and Baretta are the most violent shows in prime time, while Chico and the Man, Sirota's Court and the Mary Tyler Moore Show were among 11 programs that had no violence of significance at all.

CBS, as in our summer study, continues to be by far the least violent network, with ABC second and NBC the most violent.

It is significant that American Motors, Schlitz and Burger King are within the top 10 most violent advertisers in both our summer and fall study. Prudential is the only corporation that remained at the top of the least violent in both studies.

Shopper Toys was able to advertise in the pre-Christmas season while qualifying among the least violent advertisers. Sears and Kodak, however, found their pre-Christmas advertising placing them in the top ten of the most violent.

We issue our rankings of programs and advertisers in order to provide accurate knowledge about the sources and supporters of television violence to a public that is clearly increasing its concern. However, behind these rankings is an extensive monitoring process which results in detailed computer profiles of prime time violence that are designed to be a working tool for concerned advertisers and industry leaders.

CS 501 711

If advertisers want to respond to the rising public concern over television violence, our reports will help them evaluate their buying program. Since the new fall programming will start its re-runs in late December, the NCCB Violence Profiles give network-by-network, series-by-series, program-by-program reports on television violence in prime time. It is, in effect, a violence TV Guide to intelligent buying of television time by concerned advertisers.

The American Medical Association emphasized that one of their goals in supporting the study was to encourage a positive impact on the advertising and television industries. According to AMA's Executive Vice President James H. Sammons, M. D., "This action represents a strong commitment by AMA to endorse and finance activities that will encourage the industry to reduce the amount of violence in TV programming."

There are a number of issues to address today. (1) Our current study is the result of a careful research and development process that included a major test of the proposal by industry critics. It was suggested that our monitoring should be based on a more limited standard of violence than the Gerbner definition we used in our summer study. (2) Our studies are proving to have a major impact on public groups and private citizens who are planning their own action programs to reduce television violence. (3) We believe our approach to influencing advertisers is wholly consistent with the First Amendment responsibilities of broadcasters and does not constitute censorship.

I - THE DEFINITION OF VIOLENCE

Perhaps the most significant finding to report today is the result of our comparison of industry suggested standards for violence with our use of the Gerbner definition.

When we completed our summer study, the Markle Foundation provided a grant for an evaluation conference. Groups such as the AMA, PTA, and Action for Childrens Television sent representatives, as did all three TV networks and many major advertisers and agencies. At that time industry representatives argued strongly that our use of the

Gerbner definition was unfair because it included humorous incidents of violence and light acts of violence such as a slap. They argued that our advertiser and program rankings would be considered inaccurate by them unless based on those acts of violence that they considered unquestionable -- such as murders, killings and beatings.

Although we noted that there was considerable research showing that light and humorous violence does have an influence, and that the industry had produced no independent research to discredit this view, we nonetheless agreed to subject their suggestion to a fair test.

Our current study includes two parallel rankings. The first ranking of advertisers and programs is based on the Gerbner definition. The second ranking was based on what we termed "aggressive personal incidents of violence which clearly and intentionally threatened personal injury in a serious way" -- such as killings, beatings or rapes.

When we completed our current study we compared the two rankings only to find that there was no significant variation between the two rankings whatsoever. The least and most violent advertisers by both standards were not only often identical on both lists (Chevrolet, Anacin, and American Motors are 1, 2 and 3 on both lists) but variations were insignificant (Sears and Kodak are 5 and 6 on one list, and 4 and 5 on the other). The same was true of the program rankings.

The results of this careful, costly and extensive comparison lead us to conclude that our use of the Gerbner definition is proper, accurate and fair, and that charges by industry critics are disproved by their own methodology. The simple fact is that a show that is very violent by the Gerbner definition has also proven to be very violent by another reasonable definition. The same is true for the nonviolent rankings.

In view of the fact that the Gerbner inclusion of humorous and light violence is supported by considerable independent research, we can only report to the public and the industry that the definition has proven sound, accurate and reliable under considerable testing and intense scrutiny. Therefore, all the rankings which we are releasing are based entirely on the Gerbner definition. Furthermore, advertisers who obtain our

violence profiles will find each act of violence detailed and can make their own comparisons and judgments.

II - HARD INFORMATION FOR A GROWING CONSTITUENCY

There is no question that there is a growing public outcry and a growing number of organized efforts directed at excessive television violence and that the information we provide is an important resource. The PTA has declared television violence as its major action target this year. Many PTA members have asked for and received our rankings to support their local efforts. The AMA will be disseminating the results of our study through its publications. A representative of the Jaycees has written sponsors who were named in our first study and Sheriff Buckley of Middlesex County, Massachusetts (Boston Area) is calling on the Chiefs of Police of other major cities to join him in personal visits to the heads of the corporations at the top of our most violent list. Many private citizens have written advertisers in response to our study, and many of them have sent us copies of the responses they received from the corporations. Additionally, a coalition of national church groups (including the Church of the Brethren, United Church of Christ and the National Council of Churches) which hold stock in major corporations are using our list of most violent advertisers to take appropriate stockholder actions.

Like the audience in the new movie Network, the viewing public is starting to say "We're mad as hell, and we're not going to take it any more."

III ADVERTISERS AND CENSORSHIP -- OR HOW TO TALK BACK TO YOUR TV SET

The only other significant criticism that our study has received has involved our holding advertisers to account for the violent content of programs they use as vehicles for their advertising. A response by Peter Allport, President of the Association of National Advertisers, to requests about our last report is indicative of both the attitude and the problem. Mr. Allport states:

> The approach (NCCB's) is wrong in principle and practice. It is as wrong for television as it would be for any other medium. An individual advertiser may -- and in

> fact has an obligation to his stockholders and employees -- to select the program with which he wishes to be associated in accord with his best marketing judgments. Equally he has every right to purchase time or space according to other criteria. But the use of economic muscle to dictate what broadcasters should not present to the American public must be as strongly resisted for television as it would be were advertisers to try to dictate the editorial content of newspapers or magazine.

What Mr. Allport is really saying is that it is perfectly all right for advertisers to use <u>their</u> economic muscle, but that the viewer, who is supposed to benefit from television programming under First Amendment freedoms, should ignore this influence. Mr. James Robeson of the Ford Motor Company, writing to a concerned citizen who used our public report, also suggested that only the networks should be criticized by the public, but again admitted that Ford also exercisesconsiderable influence on television programming it is associated with. Mr. Robeson states:

> On many occasions, we have refrained from placing our commercials in such (violent) programs even though they have been among the most efficient for reaching our best new car and truck prospects. We have withdrawn our commercials from more than one televised film after learning of the violent or otherwise unacceptable nature of its story line.

Mr. Robeson goes on to point out that Ford is shifting more of its advertising to sports.

These examples are but a small sample of the overwhelming evidence that the purpose of television is to deliver an audience to an advertiser and not to deliver programs on demand to a selective audience. To ignore this process when asking the public to talk back to their TV sets is to perpetuate the misguided illusion that broadcasters use their First Amendment freedoms solely to protect their freedom to reach an audience with a variety of programs. We cannot ignore that they use their freedom and their license to deliver product advertising into American homes.

We agree that viewers should express their concerns to the networks and vote with their dials. Our study helps the public to make more informed choices of prime time programming. But we also insist that the public has a right to voice its opinion where the buck stops, as well as where the dial stops. It is the consumer of products

that pays for the cost of television advertising, and it is the advertiser that uses that purchasing power to have a great impact on the kind of programming that enters the American home. To exclude the public from its right to participate in the real marketplace of television is to deny the best interests of the public and the real obligations of broadcasters.

We might also add that we sympathize with the Ford Motor Company's statement that "While we (Ford) will continue to avoid those action/adventure programs that are the most objectionable whenever we can, we may not be able to avoid all such programs until reasonably acceptable alternatives are available." NCCB has never advocated the censorship or withdrawal of all violence from television. We continue to state that violence is often essential to a dramatic statement or the understanding of the day's news events.

Far from advocating censorship, we have consistently advocated the affirmative responsibilities of broadcasters to provide a wider variety of quality programming that reflects the real interests and diversity of the American public. We feel that both the viewer and the advertiser have a right to demand more from broadcasters than a simple choice between sitcoms and action/adventure shows.

Far from advocating that either a public group or a group of advertisers set themselves up as censors of television violence, we are simply providing advertisers and the public a carefully prepared report so that they can make informed and wholly individual choices about television programming in an open marketplace.

Our violence profiles are now just as current as the ratings books that advertisers use to determine their buying or advertising time. Since most of the fall programming will be going into re-runs, the advertiser has an accurate, thorough and current report on television violence in prime time programming. We are offering a violence TV guide to concerned advertisers so that they may make more careful decisions about their association with television violence in prime time programs and respond to the concerns of the consumers of their products who ultimately pay

for and are influenced by those programs.

IV METHODOLOGY

Finally, I want to briefly review the methodology employed in our study in conjunction with bi Associates. The TV monitoring firm or bi Associates has long specialized in recording information about advertiser spots on television. With the assistance of the J. M. Kaplan Fund and the Laras Fund, the bi monitors were trained by associates of Dr. George Gerbner of the Annenberg School of Communications to understand the definition of violence developed by Dr. Gerbner, and to accurately identify incidents of violence that fall within that definition.

In our current study, two monitors were utilized to record all information for each network live off-the-air. This allowed a constant double check of all information. Additionally, during one random test week, Dr. Nancy Signorielli of Dr. Gerbner's staff at the Annenberg School of Communications also had two monitors recording data -- one off the air and one from video taped material for more careful scrutiny. On the basis of this second monitoring process, Dr. Signorielli was able to certify that the bi monitors have a high degree of consistency and reliability in their reporting when compared with the additional Gerbner trained monitors. A copy of her report is included in each press packet.

The final rating figure that determines the ranking of both advertisers and programs is a combination of the number of violent incidents and the length of time of those incidents for each advertiser or program expressed as a percentage of the total number of violent incidents and the total length of the incidents in all of prime time. These figures are then computed on a basis of an average week for the total study period.

Advertisers are identified either as an individual product or a group of products depending on how the advertising time is purchased. If the purchase is made for a group of products under a corporate name, that name is identified. If the company has many products, but buys advertising separately for each product, then the single

product name is given.

A represenative of the computer firm that provided the machinery for the study assisted in conductinga series of programs to assure and double check all stages of the study for accuracy.

We now offer to the public and to the advertiser what we feel has proven to be, under intense scrutiny and evaluation, an accurate, current, reliable and thorough violence TV guide to the informed selection and sponsorship of prime time television programming.

STATEMENT BY RICHARD E. PALMER, M.D.

PRESIDENT, AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

AMA's House of Delegates, at it's annual convention in June of this year, endorsed the policy that TV violence is an environmental hazard threatening the health of American youth.

In reviewing the various program options available to an organization with a broad-based constituency like the AMA, we decided the most positive activity we could support at this time was NCCB's study of the new fall programming.

We believe AMA's $25,000 grant signals a serious commitment on the part of the AMA to support programs that will encourage the industry to respond with substantive improvements in programming. We congratulate the NCCB in their efforts to encourage media reform and bring to the attention of the public an issue of significant concern to medicine.

As medical professionals, we have an obligation to warn against adverse health effects when scientific evidence supports such a viewpoint. AMA's concern in the area of television violence focuses primarily on the mental health of children.

Television is a unique medium. Only television can combine visual and auditory stimuli in an intimate setting on a regular

basis. We all know now that children spend a great deal of their leisure time watching TV. And we have seen that violence is a prevalent theme in American television entertainment.

Of special concern to the AMA and parents alike is the fundamental issue of the child's healthy growth and development. The American people should be concerned with the types of values and role models the media is presenting to a vast youthful audience whose perceptions of society and reality and whose individual value systems are clearly in early developmental stages.

The physician may be the only source of professional contact until the child enters school. And the physician -- especially the family practitioner, pediatrician and child psychiatrist -- understands all too well the struggles of the young child to achieve an identity ... establish a well-integrated personality ... and understand the complexities and inconsistencies of the world around him.

Television is a powerful, pervasive force in the child's environment. If the programming he is exposed to consists largely of violent content, his perceptions of the real world may be significantly distorted, and his psychological development may be adversely affected.

We, at the AMA, urge the television industry to join with us and all of the concerned organizations in a cooperative spirit

to make television a MEDIUM OF RESPONSIBILITY ... a medium concerned with presenting programming that is truly reflective of the real world ... a medium that can teach constructive solutions to the problems that plague our society ... a medium that reflects the highest values of our culture ... a medium that truly serves the public interest and welfare.

RECEIVED NOV 15 1976

AMA NEWS RELEASE

Frank D. Campion/Director of Public Relations Home Phone (312) 446-7277
Joseph Breu/News Bureau Director/Home Phone (312) 348-3895

FOR A.M. RELEASE TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1976

For further information contact:
Suellen Muldoon
Office: 312/751-6613

AMA GIVES $25,000 GRANT TO SUPPORT TV VIOLENCE MONITORING

CHICAGO -- The American Medical Association announced today a grant of $25,000 to support the TV violence monitoring activities of the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting.

A media reform group based in Washington, D.C., the NCCB is concerned with documenting the amount of television violence portrayed in prime time network television. Their goal is to encourage more thoughtful and informed choices on the part of the public, broadcasters, advertisers and producers.

"This action represents a strong commitment by AMA to endorse and finance activities that will encourage the industry to reduce the amount of violence in TV programming, according to James H. Sammons, M.D., AMA's executive vice president.

"Our grant will subsidize NCCB's study of the new fall programming. We believe NCCB is providing a valuable service by ranking TV programs and sponsors according to the extent with which they are identified with violence. The American public has a right to know which programs contain the most violence so that people can then make responsible decisions about family viewing."

At its annual convention in June of this year, AMA's House of Delegates endorsed the position that TV violence is an environmental hazard affecting the health of American children.

-MORE-

NCCB's study, to be completed in early December, is designed to have direct impact on advertisers, ad agencies and networks. Incorporating some procedural refinements in the monitoring and ranking process, the new system will be based on monitoring reports tabulated by using either of two definitions of violence.

Developed by George Gerbner, Ph.D., of the U. of Pennsylvania, the first definition includes overt forms of violence, as well as natural disasters, car chases and comedic violence. The second definition is limited to aggressive violence against individuals -- physical violence, use of weapons and capital crimes.

Both indexes will be released to the public unless the advertiser rankings differ by a serious margin. In that case, only the ranking based on the second definition will be published.

#

Appendix:

Definitions of the Violence Measures

1. Number of Violent Actions in the Program: The total number of violent actions observed in the program, according to the following definitions:

   a. Violence is the:

      (1) overt expression of physical force (with or without weapon) against self or other:

      and/or

      (2) compelling action against one's will on pain of being hurt or killed;

      and/or

      (3) actually hurting or killing;

   Such that:

      (1) it must be plausible and credible: no idle threats, verbal abuse, or gestures with no credible violent consequences, are included;

      (2) it may be intentional or accidental: violent accidents, catastrophies, acts of nature and the like, are included;

      (3) it must involve human or human-like characters (e.g. Lassie the dog) as targets: mere actions against property are not violence. Thus the slaughter of the cattle herd in the movie Hud is not violence, but the killing of Bambi's mother in the Disney film is;

      (4) it may be humorous, serious, or a combination of both, as long as the previous conditions are satisfied.

   b. A Violent Action is a scene of some violence (see above) continuous in time and location and confined to the same agents.

      (1) Continuity of Time and Location: If a violent action is interrupted temporarily by either a flashback or flashforward, or a cut to another location (i.e., the proverbial "meanwhile ..."), as long

as it continues in "real time" it is the same act. If the action is continuous in time, but the location changes (e.g., a chase scene), it is the same act.

(2) Agents: If one or more people, not originally involved, becomes a participant in ongoing violence, the scene becomes another violent action at the point at which the "new" agent becomes involved. Note that the new agent may have just entered the scene, or may have been present from the beginning but not previously involved (e.g. a witness). Note also that the new agent could become involved either actively (by freely joining in) or reactively (e.g. is attacked by an original agent). Finally, this criterion only pertains to additions to the original set of agents: if the number of participants in a multiple-agent action is reduced (e.g. by death, injury, flight, etc.) there is no corresponding adjustment to a new violent action.

2. Total Time of Violence in the Program: The duration in seconds is recorded separately for each violent action identified by the above criteria. These times are then summed for each program to get a measure of the total amount of time during which violence was shown in the program.

AN EVALUATION OF A SYSTEM FOR THE CONTINUAL MONITORING AND PERIODIC REPORTING OF THE COMMERICIAL SPONSORSHIP OF TELEVISION VIOLENCE

prepared for

The National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting

by

Michael Eleey and Nancy Signorielli

December 7, 1976

CONTENTS

Summary

Scope of the Study

Sample of Programs

Design of the Test

Method of Evaluation

Results

Discussion

Appendix: Definitions of the Measures

Summary

The purpose of this evaluation is to ascertain the degree to which data recorded by BI monitors systematically reflect relevant aspects of the television programs being monitored, or conversely, to determine the extent to which error -- in the form of individuals' biases, problems of interpretation, or other idiosyncrasies -- is present in the monitoring procedure.

The major results of the reliability test indicate that (a) BI monitors are continuing to apply the definitions (specified in the appendix) in a consistent, systematic manner, but that (b) BI monitors tend to report slightly lower violence levels than do externally trained monitors.

Scope of the Study

This study is confined to the analysis of the reliability of two measures of violence: (1) the number of violent actions in the program, and (2) the total time of violence in the program. The complete definitions of these measures are given in the Appendix to this report.

The findings of this study therefore refer only to these two measures, as they are defined in the Appendix, and cannot be properly extended or applied to any other violence measures, whether derived from these two or separately recorded.

Sample of Programs

The analysis was conducted on a sample of 23 prime-time network television programs aired from Nov. 11, 1976 through Nov. 17, 1976. The programs included all dramatic and variety programs aired between 8PM and 11PM. Sports events, such as Monday Night Football, news, public affairs and documentary programs were not included. One network was chosen for each evening over a one-week period. For maximum efficiency, the sampling schedule was strategically arranged to minimize the number both of regular-program preemptions, and of programs such as public-affairs broadcasts which are devoid of relevant violence.

Design of the Test

Four independent observations of the number and cumulative length of violent actions were made for each program in the sample. Two observations were recorded by specially trained BI personnel during the course of their normal monitoring duties, as the programs were being broadcast. The other two were made by two coders trained specifically for this analysis who had no contact with BI Associates or its staff: in one case the observation was recorded at the time of broadcast, in a manner similar to the procedure used by BI personnel; in the other case the observation was made the following day from a videotaped copy of the program which was replayed, in part or totally, as often as necessary for the coder to resolve any problems or ambiguities. These are referred to below as "external" observations.

This method thus allows the comparison of monitors' agreement in three important ways:

(1) agreement between BI observations, all of which were made at the time of broadcast;

(2) agreement among the two BI observations and the external observation made at the time of broadcast;

(3) agreement among the two BI observations and the external observation made the following day with the advantage of videotape and "instant replay".

Method of Evaluation

The recorded observations were keypunched and statistical measures of agreement were calculated by computer for the various comparisons. From a statistical perspective, a certain amount of agreement can be expected to occur simply as a result of chance, but chance agreement cannot be considered informative about the reliability of the instructions, training, or monitoring process. Thus the agreement coefficients presented below adjust for chance, reflecting the degree to which agreement exceeds that due merely to chance. A coefficient of 1.0 would indicate perfect reliability (seldom attained in practice), while at another extreme a coefficient of zero would indicate that all of the agreement can be accounted for by chance -- in which case instructions, training and standardization of recording procedures would have shown no effect.*

* A detailed derivation of the agreement coefficient used can be found in K. Krippendorff, "Bivariate Agreement Coefficients for the Reliability of Data," pp. 139-150 in E.F. Borgatta and G.W. Bohrnstedt (eds.) Sociological Methodology: 1970, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Results

The agreement coefficients for the violence variables are given in Table 1. The important comparisons are summarized below:

(1) Agreement between BI observations

High levels of agreement, 99% above chance, were attained for the two violence measures recorded by BI monitors.

(2) Agreement among the three time-of-broadcast procedures, BI and external monitors:

Comparing the violence measures recorded jointly by the external coder and the BI staff, the degree of agreement is somewhat lower but still at a satisfactory level.

(3) Agreement between BI time-of-broadcast observations and external "instant replay" observation:

In this comparison we find that while there is no change in agreement on the total time devoted to violence, agreement on the number of violent actions is again lower, but still at a satisfactory level.

Discussion

The high degree of agreement between the BI observations (99% above chance) indicates that the definitions and interpretations of the violence measures are continuing to be applied in a systematic and consistent manner by the BI monitors. The lower agreement between the BI monitors and external monitors could be the result of a combination of factors:

(1) BI monitors recorded violence data while also pursuing their other duties of monitoring commercials; the external monitors recorded

Table 1:

Coefficients of Agreement

Agreement between:	Measures of Violence: Number of violent actions in program	Measures of Violence: Total time (in seconds) of violence in program
(1) BI observations	.99	.99
(2) BI observations and external off-the-air observation	.84	.95
(3) BI observations and external "instant replay" (videotape) observation	.80	.95

only violence data and were free of other potentially distracting requirements. Other things equal, the external observers might (as a result) identify more violent actions on the average.

(2) With the advantage of videotape replay, finer distinctions are possible, and consequently one might expect that more acts of violence will be distinguished by this method than when violence is monitored "off-the-air".

Table 2 suggests, although not conclusively, that these effects were indeed present. BI monitors tend to both identify fewer violent actions and report lower time-of-violence measures than do the external monitors. Furthermore, the external "stop-tape" procedure resulted in the highest average levels, as anticipated. It should be noted that while none of the differences are statistically significant, the number of observations is relatively small, and a larger test sample could give different results.

Table 2:

Violence-Measure Averages

	Measure 1: average number of violent actions per program	Measure 2: average total time of violence per program
BI observation #1	4.1	1 min., 54 secs.
BI observation #2	4.3	1 min., 50 secs.
external observation, off-the-air	5.5	2 min., 8 secs.
external observation, stop-tape	5.7	2 min., 22 secs.

TIME	NETWORK DAY	DATE	SHOW LENGTH * = 0 +	VIOLENT EPS DURA	TL	TAB	ALCOHOL INC	PGM	GERBNER DEFINIT	SHOW LENGTH * = 0 +	VIOLENT EPS DURA	TL	TAB	DRUG MEN INC.	PGM.	1
	NBC THURSDAY NIGHT	6 24 76														
08 00 30	SEARCH FOR SHINOHARA		60						SEARCH FOR SHINOHARA							
08 05 15	VIOLENT EPISODE BOMBING										.1	1				
08 06 15	VIOLENT EPISODE BOMBING										.1	1				
08 07 05	VIOLENT EPISODE PLANE CRASH										.1	1				
08 07 30	VIOLENT EPISODE PLANE CRASH										.1	1				
08 07 35	VIOLENT EPISODE PLANE CRASH										.1	1				
08 10 40	VIOLENT EPISODE BOMBING										.1	1				
08 23 10	VIOLENT EPISODE PLANE CRASH										.1	1				
			* 60						*	60+	.7	7				
09 00 00	YOUNG SAVAGES		120						YOUNG SAVAGES							
09 05 25	VIOLENT EPISODE KNIFE THREAT			.3	1						.3	1				
09 06 05	VIOLENT EPISODE CHASE ON FOOT										1.0	1				
09 07 40	VIOLENT EPISODE COERCION										.1	1				
09 08 30	VIOLENT EPISODE SLAP										.1	1				
09 09 05	VIOLENT EPISODE SHOVE										.1	1				
09 17 15	VIOLENT EPISODE COERCION										.1	1				
09 17 25	VIOLENT EPISODE SLAP										.1	1				
09 20 00	VIOLENT EPISODE STABBING			.2	1						.2	1				
09 33 40	VIOLENT EPISODE HAIR PULLING										.1	1				
09 46 15	VIOLENT EPISODE RESTRAINT										.1	1				
09 49 10	VIOLENT EPISODE SHOVE										.1	1				
09 49 20	VIOLENT EPISODE FIST FIGHT			.1	1						.1	1				
09 57 20	VIOLENT EPISODE KNIFE THREAT			.1	1						.1	1				
10 02 35	VIOLENT EPISODE SHOVE										.1	1				
10 06 45	VIOLENT EPISODE FIGHT			.5	1						.5	1				
10 13 55	VIOLENT EPISODE SLAP										.1	1				
10 19 25	VIOLENT EPISODE FIST FIGHT			1.0	1						1.0	1				
10 32 50	VIOLENT EPISODE FIGHT			.1	1						.1	1				
10 43 55	VIOLENT EPISODE RESTRAINT										.1	1				
10 44 15	VIOLENT EPISODE RESTRAINT										.5	1				
			120+	2.3	7					120+	4.9	20				
	NBC WEEK TOTALS		60 120	2.3	7	0	0		0	180	5.6	27	0	0		
	FRIDAY NIGHT NBC	6 25 76														
08 00 25	SANFORD & SON		30						SANFORD & SON							
			* 30				1	30*	*	30						
08 30 00	ROCKFORD FILES		60						ROCKFORD FILES							
09 04 45	VIOLENT EPISODE RESTRAINT										.3	1				
09 19 50	VIOLENT EPISODE GUN THREAT			.2	1						.2	1				
09 20 55	VIOLENT EPISODE CAR CHASE										2.0	1				
09 21 05	VIOLENT EPISODE COPTER CHASE										1.6	1				
			60+	.2	1					60+	4.1	4				
09 30 00	POLICE STORY		60						POLICE STORY							
09 34 45	VIOLENT EPISODE BEATING CHASE			.9	1						.9	1				
09 43 45	VIOLENT EPISODE ATTACKED										.1	1				
09 55 50	VIOLENT EPISODE COERCION										.1	1				
09 57 40	VIOLENT EPISODE FIGHT			.1	1						.1	1				
10 11 10	VIOLENT EPISODE FIST FIGHT			.2	1						.2	1				
10 23 50	VIOLENT EPISODE SHOOTING CRASHH			.5	1						.5	1				

TIME	NETWORK DAY	DATE	SHOW LENGTH * = O +	VIOLENT EPS DURA TL TAB	ALCOHOL INC PGM	GERDNER DEFINIT	SHOW LENGTH * = O +	VIOLENT EPS DURA TL TAB	DRUG MEN 2 INC. PGM.
09 39 50	AMC PACER		30						
09 40 20	SUAVE SHAMPOO		30						
09 46 15	VIOLENT EPISODE RESTRAINT							.1 1	
09 49 10	VIOLENT EPISODE SHOVE							.1 1	
09 49 20	VIOLENT EPISODE FIST FIGHT			.1 1				.1 1	
09 57 20	VIOLENT EPISODE KNIFE THREAT			.1 1				.1 1	
09 58 10	DATSUN F 10		30						
09 58 40	NYTOL		30						
09 59 10	LYSOL		30						
09 59 40	BURGER KING		30						
10 00 10	PROMO TOMORROW		20						
10 02 35	VIOLENT EPISODE SHOVE							.1 1	
10 06 45	VIOLENT EPISODE FIGHT			.5 1				.5 1	
10 13 55	VIOLENT EPISODE SLAP							.1 1	
10 14 20	EARTHBORN SHAMPOO		30						
10 14 50	SOFT AND DRI DEODORANT		30						
10 15 20	MR COFFEE		30						
10 15 50	YELLOW PAGES		30						
10 16 20	PROMO 1776		20						
10 19 25	VIOLENT EPISODE FIST FIGHT			1.0 1				1.0 1	
10 32 50	VIOLENT EPISODE FIGHT			.1 1				.1 1	
10 36 40	SCHLITZ LITE BEER		30						
10 37 10	EVEREADY FLASH LIGHT		30						
10 37 40	TOYOTA CARS		30						
10 38 10	WOOLITE		30						
10 43 55	VIOLENT EPISODE RESTRAINT							.1 1	
10 44 15	VIOLENT EPISODE RESTRAINT							.5 1	
10 55 25	DATSUN KING CAB		30						
10 55 55	CANADA DRY GINGER ALE		30						
10 56 25	DRISTAN		30						
10 56 55	BIC LIGHTER		30						
10 57 55	PROMO THE NELSON AFFAIR		20						
	CONFLICT WITH CANADA DRY								
	3 MINUTES								
			120+	2.3 8			120+	4.9 21	
	3 3								
	END OF NETWORK								
	NBC WEEK TOTALS		60 120	2.3 8	0 0	0	180	5.6 28	0 0
	FRIDAY NIGHT NBC		6 25 76						
08 00 00	PROMO TONIGHTS SHOWS		25						
08 00 25	SANFORD & SON		30			SANFORD & SON			
08 01 15	NICE N EASY HAIR COLOR		30						
08 01 45	DAIRIL PAIN RELIEVER		30						
08 10 10	ALCOHOL EPISODE				1				
08 10 50	BELL SYSTEM		30						

TIME	NETWORK DAY	DATE	SHOW LENGTH * = 0 +		VIOLENT EPS DURA TL	TAB	ALCOHOL INC	PGM	GERBNER DEFINIT	SHOW LENGTH * = 0 +		VIOLENT EPS DURA TL	TAB	DRUG MEN INC.	PGM.
	NBC THURSDAY NIGHT	6 24 76													
08 00 30	SEARCH FOR SHINOHARA		60						SEARCH FOR SHINOHARA						
			* 60							*	60+	,7	7		
09 00 00	YOUNG SAVAGES		120						YOUNG SAVAGES						
				120+	2,3	8					120+	4,9	21		
	NBC WEEK TOTALS		60	120	2,3	8	0	0		0	180	5,6	28	0	0
	FRIDAY NIGHT NBC	6 25 76													
08 00 25	SANFORD & SON		30						SANFORD & SON						
			* 30				1	30*		*	30				
08 30 00	ROCKFORD FILES		60						ROCKFORD FILES						
				60+	,2	1					60+	4,1	4		
09 30 00	POLICE STORY		60						POLICE STORY						
				60+	1,8	5	1	60*			60+	2,0	7		
	NBC WEEK TOTALS		30	120	2,0	6	2	90		30	120	6,1	11	0	0
	CBS TOTALS														
	ABC TOTALS														
	NBC TOTALS		120	360	6,3	20	4	180		60	420	17,	30		0

YOU are the one who can temper violence on television.

But only if you make your opinions heard where it counts. Here's how...

Advertiser Ranking

The following listing shows the ranking of advertisers according to the amount of violence they sponsored in prime time. They are ranked according to the 12 that supported the least violence to the 12 that supported the most violence.

LEAST VIOLENT SPONSORS

Rank	Sponsor	Rating
1	Peter Paul Candy	3
2	Hallmark	8
3	Texaco	10
4	Whirlpool Appliances	13
5	Prudential Insurance	17
6	Jean Nate	18
7	Schaper Toys	20
8	Green Giant Vegetables	30
8	Keebler Cookies	30
10	Carnation Dog Foods	32
11	Efferdent	34
11	Quasar Television	34

MOST VIOLENT SPONSORS

Rank	Sponsor	Rating
1	Chevrolet Cars	751
2	Whitehall Labs—Anacin	596
3	American Motors Cars	498
4	Sears Roebuck & Company	417
5	Eastman Kodak Products	363
6	Schlitz Beer	356
7	Procter & Gamble Soaps	353
8	General Foods Food Products Division	341
9	Burger King Corporation	315
10	Frito Lay Incorporated	303
11	Mr. Coffee Coffee Maker	300
11	Campbells Soup Company	300

Movie Rankings

LEAST TO MOST VIOLENT

Rank	Network	Movie	Rating
1	CBS	Wednesday Movie	38
2	NBC	Wednesday Movie	48
3	NBC	Monday Movie	64
4	ABC	Friday Movie	67
5	NBC	Sunday Movie	71
6	CBS	Friday Movie	92
7	NBC	Saturday Movie	101
8	ABC	Sunday Movie	128

Notes

Ratings. The rankings were computed as follows: The combination of the number of violent incidents and the length of time of those incidents was expressed as a percentage of the total number of violent incidents and the total length of the incidents in all prime time. These figures were then computed on a basis of an average week for the total study period and that final figure is the rating figure given above.

Definition of Violence. The Gerbner definition of a violent action as used in our study is: an overt expression of physical force (with or without weapon) against one's self or other, a compelling action against one's will on pain of being hurt or killed, and/or an actual hurting or killing. An action to be considered violent must be plausible and credible and must include human or human-like characters. It may be an intentional or accidental action, humorous or serious or a combination of both as long as the previous conditions are satisfied.

Despite the careful research that went into the development of this definition of violence, industry critics suggested that this definition was too broad. Therefore, for our fall ratings, NCCB conducted two parallel studies, one based on the Gerbner definition, and one on the industry suggested definition. The results showed no significant divergence in ratings thus confirming that the use of the Gerbner definition is sound, accurate and fair when measured against other standards.

Program Ranking

The following is a complete ranking of all prime time network programming from the most to the least violent shows during the monitoring period.

	Network	Rating
CPO Sharkey	NBC	0
McLean Stevenson	NBC	0
Doc	CBS	0
Sirotas Court	NBC	0
Mr T & Tina	ABC	0
Ball Four	CBS	0
Phyllis	CBS	0
Mary Tyler Moore	CBS	0
Bob Newhart Show	CBS	0
Chico & the Man	NBC	0
All's Fair	CBS	0
Alice	CBS	1
Rhoda	CBS	1
The Tony Randall Show	ABC	1
Barney Miller	ABC	1
Welcome Back Kotter	ABC	1
What's Happening	ABC	1
Maude	CBS	2
The Practice	NBC	2
Sanford & Son	NBC	3
The Jeffersons	CBS	3
One Day At a Time	CBS	3
All in the Family	CBS	3
The Nancy Walker Show	ABC	4
Gibbsville	NBC	4
The Waltons	CBS	5
Good Times	CBS	5
Mash	CBS	7
Executive Suite	CBS	7
Happy Days	ABC	7
Tony Orlando & Dawn	CBS	7
Little House on the Prairie	NBC	8
Donny & Marie	ABC	9
Family	ABC	10
Laverne & Shirley	ABC	11
Once an Eagle	NBC	11
The Captain & Tenille	ABC	12
Rich Man, Poor Man	ABC	13
Sonny & Cher	CBS	16
Carol Burnett Show	CBS	17
Emergency	NBC	17
Wonder Woman	ABC	18
Blue Knight	CBS	18
Holmes & Yoho	ABC	20
Captain & the Kings	NBC	21
Gemini Man	NBC	25
Dick Van Dyke	NBC	26
Wonderful World of Disney	NBC	28
Spencers Pilots	CBS	29
Switch	CBS	30
McCld/Colum/Quincy/McMil	NBC	31
Bionic Woman	ABC	33
Streets of San Francisco	ABC	38
Barnaby Jones	CBS	38
Rockford Files	NBC	45
Police Woman	NBC	47
Charlie's Angels	ABC	48
Most Wanted	ABC	48
Serpico	NBC	51
Delvecchio	CBS	52
Police Story	NBC	52
Kojak	CBS	52
Six Million Dollar Man	ABC	54
Hawaii Five-O	CBS	60
Baa Baa Black Sheep	NBC	65
Baretta	ABC	65
Starsky & Hutch	ABC	69
Quest	NBC	86

Network Rankings

The networks were ranked according to the total violence contained in their prime time programming during the study period. CBS is the least violent network with ABC second and NBC the most violent.

Network	Rating	Network	Rating	Network	Rating
CBS	967	ABC	1111	NBC	1419

Addresses

LEAST VIOLENT SPONSORS

PETER PAUL CANDY
Austin R. Zender
Peter Paul, Inc.
New Haven Road
Naugatuck, Ct. 06770

HALLMARK
J. C. Hall
Hallmark Cards, Inc.
25th and McGee
Kansas City, Mo. 64108

TEXACO
Maurice F. Granville
Texaco, Inc.
135 East 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

WHIRLPOOL APPLIANCES
John H. Platts
Whirlpool Corporation
Administrative Center
Benton Harbor, Mi. 49022

PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE
Donald S. MacNaughton
Prudential Insurance
Co. of America
Newark, N.J. 07101

JEAN NATE
Richard M. Furland
Squibb Corp.
40 W. 57th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

SCHAPER TOYS
William Garrity
Schaper Mfg. Co.
9909 South Shore Dr.
Minneapolis, Mn. 55441

GREEN GIANT VEGETABLES
Robert C. Cosgrove
Green Giant Co.
5601 Green Valley Dr.
Minneapolis, Mn. 55437

KEEBLER COOKIES
Edwin L. Cox
Keebler Company
One Hollow Tree Lane
Elmhurst, Il. 60126

CARNATION DOG FOOD
H. E. Olson
Carnation Company
5045 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90036

EFFERDENT
E. Burke Giblin
Warner, Lambert Co.
201 Tabor Road
Morris Plains, N.J. 07950

QUASAR TELEVISION
Arthur Harada
Matsushita Electric
Co. of America
200 Park Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10017

MOST VIOLENT SPONSORS

CHEVROLET CARS
Thomas A. Murphy
General Motors Corp.
3044 West Grand Blvd.
Detroit, Mi. 48202

WHITEHALL LABS—
ANACIN
William F. Laporte
American Home Products
Corp.
685 Third Avenue
New York N.Y. 10017

AMERICAN MOTORS CARS
Roy D. Chapin, Jr.
American Motors Corp.
14520 Plymouth Road
Detroit, Mi. 48232

SEARS ROEBUCK & COMPANY
Arthur M. Wood
Sears, Roebuck & Co.
Sears Tower
Chicago, Il. 60684

EASTMAN KODAK PRODUCTS
Gerald B. Zornow
Eastman Kodak Co.
343 State Street
Rochester, N.Y. 14650

SCHLITZ BEER
Robert A. Uihlein, Jr.
Joseph Schlitz Brewing Company
P.O. Box 614
Milwaukee, Mi. 53201

PROCTER & GAMBLE SOAPS
Edward G. Harness
Procter & Gamble
P.O. Box 599
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

GENERAL FOODS
James L. Ferguson
General Foods Corporation
250 North Street
White Plains, N.Y. 10625

BURGER KING CORPORATION
William H. Spoor
Pillsbury Company
608 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Mn. 55402

FRITO LAY INCORPORATED
Donald M. Kendall
Pepsi Company Inc.
Purchase, N.Y. 10577

MR. COFFEE COFFEE MAKER
Vincent Marotta
North American Systems, Inc.
24700 Miles Road
Bedford Heights, Ohio 44146

CAMPBELLS SOUP COMPANY
John T. Dorrance, Jr.
Campbell Place
Camden, N.J. 08101

NETWORKS

ABC—Leonard H. Goldenson
1330 Ave. of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10019

CBS—William S. Paley
51 West 52nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

NBC—Julian Goodman
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N.Y. 10020

Join the
National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting
TODAY

National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting
1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
NCCB is a non-profit, tax exempt organization